

Mark J. Langer
May 12, 2000
Page 2

With regard to the Hudson casino proposal, Mr. Sikorski's primary, but by no means exclusive, role on behalf of the Mille Lacs was to contact representatives of the Interior Department and interested Members of Congress in order to educate them on the compelling policy issues weighing against the proposed request to introduce gaming at the Hudson dog track in Wisconsin. Throughout these lobbying endeavors, however, Mr. Sikorski remained, first and foremost, legal counsel to the Mille Lacs.

At pages 147 and 150 to 151, and in connection with his role concerning the Hudson casino proposal, the Report correctly describes Mr. Sikorski as counsel to, and lobbyist for, the Band.² In a number of earlier passages, however, the Report inaccurately describes Mr. Sikorski as a lobbyist, and no more, for the Mille Lacs.³ In doing so, the Report leaves the impression that Mr. Sikorski is, by profession, exclusively a lobbyist -- which he is not -- and that the Band retains him for no purpose other than lobbying -- which it does not. As a matter of consistency, completeness, and accuracy, the description of Mr. Sikorski as counsel to, and lobbyist for, the Mille Lacs is one that should be used throughout the Report and not simply at selected pages.

Out of fairness to Mr. Sikorski, and in deference to his professional standing as a practicing attorney and member of the bar of both the Minnesota and District of Columbia courts, I request that the Report be corrected in a fashion consistent with the foregoing comments. If not, then, at a minimum, this letter should be included in the Appendix to the Report.

Sincerely,



John W. Kern

cc: Office of the Independent Counsel Carol Elder Bruce

² Specifically, at page 147, footnote 230, the Report refers to Mr. Sikorski as the Mille Lacs "counsel and lobbyist"; at pages 150 to 151, the Report refers to him as "lawyer-lobbyist" for the Mille Lacs.

³ See pages 16, fn. 20; 56; 74-75, fn. 116; 111; 123; and 143.